



MURIEL GOODE-TRUFANT  
Corporation Counsel

THE CITY OF NEW YORK  
**LAW DEPARTMENT**  
100 CHURCH STREET  
NEW YORK, NY 10007

SHINEQUA CHARLES  
Labor and Employment Law Division  
Phone: (212) 356-2458  
Email: shcharle@law.nyc.gov

June 13, 2025

**VIA ECF**

Honorable LaShann DeArcy Hall  
United States District Judge  
Eastern District of New York  
225 Cadman Plaza East  
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Re: *Christopher Fugelsang v. Department of Education of the City of New York*,  
23-CV-8332 (LDH)

Dear Judge DeArcy Hall:

I am an Assistant Corporation Counsel in the office of Muriel Goode-Trufant, Corporation Counsel of the City of New York, attorney for Defendant the New York City Department of Education (“DOE”) in the above-referenced action. Plaintiff, a former DOE special education teacher brings this action *pro se*, challenging the DOE’s decision to deny him a reasonable accommodation for a religious exemption to the Covid-19 vaccine mandate and to subsequently terminate his employment for failing to establish proof of vaccination.

I write to respectfully request an extension of time, until July 8, 2025, for Defendant to respond to Plaintiff’s motion seeking leave to amend the Complaint. Plaintiff consents to this request, and this is Defendant’s first request for such an extension.

As background, Plaintiff brings a religious discrimination claim under Title VII, the N.Y.S. Human Rights Law and the N.Y.C. Human Rights Law and equal protection and due process claims under § 1983. This Court dismissed the original Complaint on March 31, 2025, finding that Plaintiff failed to allege his employment discrimination claims under both federal and state law. See ECF Dkt. No. 16. On April 11, 2025, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1-3). See ECF Dkt. No. 19. By Order dated April 30 2025, the Court denied Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration. The Court, however, found that Plaintiff actually seeks leave to amend the Complaint and directed Plaintiff, if he wishes to file an Amended Complaint, to file within 30 days a motion seeking leave to amend with the proposed Amended Complaint attached as an exhibit. The Court further directed that Plaintiff’s “motion should explain how the proposed Amended Complaint addresses the pleading defects.” On May 30, 2025, Plaintiff filed a letter motion seeking leave to file an Amended Complaint, attaching a lengthy 120-page proposed Amended Complaint. The Court has not yet set a deadline for Defendant’s response to Plaintiff’s motion to amend.

The reason for the requested enlargement is due to professional obligations in other matters. In particular, the undersigned has multiple motion deadlines and a settlement conference in other matters, including the following: a motion to dismiss due on June 16, 2025 in state court in *Claudine Augustin v. City of New York*, Index Number 153337/2025; a motion to dismiss due on June 18, 2025 in federal court in *Brown v. HRA, et al.*, 23-CV-09113; a settlement conference scheduled for June 24, 2025 in *Hall v. DOE*, 23-CV-10385; and a reply due on July 2, 2025 in federal court in *Vora v New York City Department of Education, et. al.*, 22-CV-10891. The requested extension, therefore, will enable me to finalize my review of the lengthy, 120-page proposed Amended Complaint and to draft Defendants' response to Plaintiff's motion to amend.

Accordingly, Defendant respectfully requests that the Court grant an extension of time, until July 8, 2025, to respond to Plaintiff's motion seeking leave to amend. The requested extension will not affect any other deadlines.

I thank the Court for its consideration of the within request.

Respectfully submitted,

[ECF] /S/

SHINEQUA CHARLES

Assistant Corporation Counsel

cc: Christopher Fugelsang (via ECF)  
Plaintiff Pro Se  
216 Beach Breeze Pl Apt. 2  
Arverne, NY 11692  
(718)928-4483  
cfugelsang@gmail.com